



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,800	12/02/2005	Atsushi Muraguchi	2870-0299PUS1	1644
2292 7590 09/17/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER YU, MELANIE J				
ART UNIT 1641		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 09/17/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/534,800

Applicant(s)

MURAGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

MELANIE YU

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/12, 8/12, 12/5, 3/14, 7/24
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-8, and the species of cylindrical, in the reply filed on 26 June 2008 is acknowledged. Applicant does not provide grounds for traversal and therefore the traversal is not found persuasive.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the continuing data, including § 371 data, must be mentioned in the first paragraph of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 2003/0030184).

Kim et al. teach a microwell array chip with multiple microwells (par. 137) and is employed to contain a single lymphocyte specimen in each microwell (single cell in microregion, par. 60; cell is a lymphocyte, par. 213; cells in each well may be the same cell, par. 196), wherein the microwell array chip is of a shape and of dimensions where only one lymphocyte is contained in each microwell (single cell immobilized in the micro orifice region, par. 60; and single cell may be a lymphocyte, par. 213).

With respect to claim 2, Kim et al. teach a cylindrical microwell (Fig. 6a, 7a and 1b, microwells are circular from a top view and vertical from a side view and are therefore cylindrical).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Kim et al. teach multiple microwells each containing a single lymphocyte specimen (plurality of microwells, par. 137; single cell in microregion, par. 60; cell is a lymphocyte, par. 213; cells in each well may be the same cell, par. 196) and having a diameter and depth from 1 to 20 microns, which is partially encompassed by the recited 5 to 100 micrometers (par. 142).

With respect to claim 6, Kim et al. teach the lymphocyte specimen contained in the microwell together with a culture medium (par. 280 and 281).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

Art Unit: 1641

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 2003/0030184).

Kim et al. teach a diameter and depth of the microwell, but do not specifically teach the diameter and depth relative to a lymphocyte cell. It has long been settled to be no more than routine experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to discover an optimum value for a result effective variable. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum of workable ranges by routine experimentation" Application of Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235-236 (C.C.P.A. 1955). "No invention is involved in discovering optimum ranges of a process by routine experimentation." *Id.* at 458, 105 USPQ at 236-237. The "discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art." Since applicant has not disclosed that the specific limitations recited in instant claim 3 are for any particular purpose or solve any stated problem, and the prior art teaches that the depth and diameter of the

Art Unit: 1641

microwell may be varied depending on the desired number of cells in the microwell and the use of the device (par. 141 and 142), absent unexpected results, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to discover the optimum workable ranges of the methods disclosed by the prior art by normal optimization procedures known in the microwell array art.

5. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 2003/0030184) in view of Walt et al. (US 6,377,721).

Kim et al. teach a lymphocyte specimen, but do not specifically teach the specimen derived from blood or being a B or T lymphocyte.

Walt et al. teach a single B lymphocyte or T lymphocyte cell (col. 15, lines 13-41) derived from blood (lymphocyte cells are blood cells, col. 15, line 28) placed in a microwell (single cell in microwell, col. 14, lines 13-15), in order to provide simultaneous analysis of single cells.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the device of Kim et al., a single B lymphocyte or T lymphocyte cell derived from blood in a microwell as taught by Walt et al. because Kim et al. is generic with respect to the type of lymphocyte cell that can be incorporated into the device and one would be motivated to use an appropriate cell for desired detection or cell motility analysis.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1641

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELANIE YU whose telephone number is (571)272-2933. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya can be reached on (571) 272-0806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melanie Yu/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1641